

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 are now pending in the application. Claims 24-55 were withdrawn from consideration and, therefore, cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 - 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that claimed invention lacks limitations that are critical or essential to the practice of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the present invention's resistance to alkaline solutions and index of refraction are critical or essential to the practice of the invention and, therefore, each base claim must contain this essential subject matter. Although the Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner, claims 1, 9, 18, and 21 have each been amended to include this subject matter. In view of these amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hironobu et al. (Hironobu) Japanese Patent Abstracts publication 06-201912. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 18 have been amended to call for an insulating film that is a vapor deposited insulating film with a thickness of 10 to 100 nm, alkaline resistant, and has a refractive index in a visible wavelength region in the range of 1.6-2.0. Hironobu does not teach such an insulating film. More specifically, Hironobu is silent with respect to an insulating film that is formed by vapor deposition, alkaline resistant, and includes a refractive index in the visible wavelength region in the range of 1.6 to 2.0. In contrast, Hironobu discloses an intermediate film that is obtained by condensing a liquid containing an organic metallic compound. See Hironobu Abstract.

Further, claims 1 and 18 have been amended to call for a liquid crystal device that when an optional wavelength in a visible wavelength region is represented by λ , a sum of an optical thickness of the insulating film and an optical thickness of the conductive film is substantially equal to a product of $\lambda/2$ and a natural number. Hironobu is completely silent with respect to such an optical thickness for a conductive film. Since Hironobu is silent with respect to these aspects of the claimed invention, claims 1 and 18 are not anticipated. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hironobu in view of Yamazaki et al. (Yamazaki) UA Patent Application Publication 2001/0013912A1. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 has been amended to call for an insulating film that is a vapor deposited insulating film with a thickness of 10 to 100 nm, is alkaline resistant, and has a refractive

index approximately equal to a refractive index of the conductive film. A refractive index approximately equal to an refractive index of the conductive film is supported in paragraph [0078] of the application where it states, "The insulating film 114 thus formed had a refractive index of approximately 1.8 which was approximately equal to that of the transparent electrode 115." Neither Hironobu nor Yamazaki teach an insulating film 114 that has a refractive index approximately equal to the conductive film. Further, neither Hironobu nor Yamazaki teach an insulating film that is alkaline resistant. Since neither Hironobu nor Yamazaki teach these aspects of the claimed invention, the alleged combination of Hironobu and Yamazaki does not yield the claimed invention.


Further, claim 9 has been amended to call for a liquid crystal device that when an optional wavelength in a visible wavelength region is represented by λ , a sum of an optical thickness of the insulating film and an optical thickness of the conductive film is substantially equal to a product of $\lambda/2$ and a natural number. As stated above in the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, Hironobu is silent with respect to such a conductive film. Yamazaki is also silent with respect to such a conductive film. As such, the claimed invention would not have been obvious in view of Hironobu and Yamazaki because there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation in either of the references, either singularly or in combination, that would lead one skilled in the art to develop a liquid crystal device with the claimed conductive film. The claimed invention, therefore, is not obvious. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 8, 2004

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/JAH/mb